



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,231	09/30/2003	Stephen R. Carter	1565.060/US1	6382
21186 7590 11/19/2010 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
BLAIR, DOUGLAS B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/19/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@slwip.com
request@slwip.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,231

Applicant(s)

CARTER ET AL.

Examiner

DOUGLAS B. BLAIR

Art Unit

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 September 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 and 21-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-14 and 21-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(c) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/20/2010 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The applicant has amended claims 8 and 21. Claims 8-14 and 21-28 are currently pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8-14 and 21-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 21 is directed towards a policy and attribute based resource session manager, residing in a computer-accessible medium. The applicant's

specification does not feature a limiting definition of the claimed computer-accessible medium so the claim can be interpreted broadly as possibly covering transitory mediums. Claims to transitory mediums do not fit into any of the statutory categories of invention. Claim 22-28 are directed towards the policy and attribute based resource session manager but not the medium. The applicant does not limit the resource session manager to hardware so claims 22-28 can be reasonably interpreted to cover software per se. Claims to software per se do not fit into any of the statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-14 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2008/0134286 by Amdur et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,072,875 to Tsudik and U.S. Patent Number 7,487,233 to Iwamoto et al.

As to claim 8, Amdur teaches a method implemented in a computer-readable medium and for executing on a proxy server (Fig. 3 embodiment) the method for policy and attribute based access to a resource, comprising: receiving, at the proxy server, a session request for access to a resource, wherein the session request is sent from a service and includes alias identity information for a principal (paragraph 94, the user's login name is considered the alias or alternatively the biometric data in paragraph 188 can be considered an alias), wherein the alias

identity information includes a password and a principal identification (paragraph 188 mentions a password and identification); mapping, by the proxy server, the alias identity information to identity information of the principal, the identity information associated with the true identity of the principal whereas the alias identity information is the password and the principal identification and the identity information and the true identity of the principal available to the proxy server by not the service or the resource (paragraphs 95-96); authenticating, by the proxy server, the identity information; acquiring, by the proxy server, a service contract for the principal, the service, and the resource, obtaining the service contract selective resource access policies and attributes which are permissibly used by the service when accessing the resource on behalf of the principal (paragraphs 95-96); defining, via the service contract, a tripartite relationship among the principal, the service, and the resource, the service contract is derived from an identity configuration of the principal (paragraph 140); and establishing, by the proxy server, a session with the service, wherein the session is controlled by the service contract (paragraphs 95-96); however Amdur does not explicitly teach alias information that is randomly generated from identity information that identifies the true identity of the principal nor does Amdur explicitly teach the claimed security strictures.

Tsudik teaches a method wherein alias information that is randomly generated from identity information that identifies the true identity of the principal (see abstract and corresponding disclosure. The encrypted identifier and password are considered randomized).

Iwamoto teaches a service contract including security strictures for the tripartite relationship including the selective resource access policies and the attributes, the access policies define operations that the service can perform on behalf of the principal against the resource and

those access policies map to attributes, the attributes define specific data fields defined within the resource (col. 8, lines 1-34) and Iwamoto teaches a service contract for a principal, a service, and a resource, the service contract is derived from an identity configuration for the principal and the identity configuration represents aggregated access policies and attributes for the principal with respect to the resource and all known services that are available to the principal, each service is an application or system that the principal used to gain access to the resource (col. 8, lines 1-34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Amdur regarding using a proxy to authenticate users with the teachings of Tsudik regarding randomized alias identification because such randomization prevents an intruder from detecting a user's identity or moves through the network.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Amdur-Tsudik combination regarding using a proxy to authenticate users and randomized alias identification with the teachings of Iwamoto regarding the claimed security strictures because Iwamoto relates to methods and systems for managing user access to networked resources (Iwamoto, col. 1, lines 7-36) such as those taught by the Amdur and Tsudik. Combining Amdur, Tsudik, and Iwamoto in the claimed manner would produce a predictable result as all three references deal with the field of security and the combination would not require any substantial modifications in order to be viable.

As to claim 9, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising accessing an identity configuration for the principal in order to acquire the selective resource access policies and attributes included within the service contract (paragraph 96).

As to claim 10, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising denying access attempts made by the service during the session when the access attempts are not included within the service contract (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 11, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising terminating the session when an event is detected that indicates the service contract is compromised or has expired (paragraphs 198-199).

As to claim 12, Amdur teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising establishing the service contract with the principal prior to receiving the session request (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 13, Amdur teaches the method of claim 12 further comprising reusing the service contract to establish one or more additional sessions with the service, wherein the one or more additional sessions are associated with one or more additional session requests made by the service (paragraphs 93-96).

As to claim 14, Amdur teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the establishing further includes establishing the service contract with the principal in response to a redirection operation performed by a proxy that intercepts a browser request issued from the principal to the service for purposes of accessing the resource (paragraph 88).

Claim 21 is rejected for the same reasoning as claim 8.

As to claim 22, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising, permitting the service to indirectly access an identity store which represents the resource, and wherein the identity store includes secure information related to the principal (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 23, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising terminating the session when the service contract expires or is compromised (paragraphs 198-199).

As to claim 24, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21, wherein the requesting of the mapping further includes interacting with an alias translator (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 25, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21, wherein the requesting of authentication further includes interacting with an identification authenticator (paragraphs 95-96).

As to claim 26, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 21 having instructions further comprising managing the session by acting as an intermediary between the service and a legacy Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) application which has access privileges to the resource (paragraphs 97-103).

As to claim 27, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 26, wherein the receiving further includes intercepting a session request that is issued from the service for the legacy LDAP application, wherein the session request includes the alias identity information (paragraphs 97-103).

As to claim 28, Amdur teaches the policy and attribute based resource session manager of claim 27 having instructions further comprising managing the session with respect to the service as if the policy based resource session manager were the legacy LDAP application (paragraphs 97-103).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOUGLAS B. BLAIR whose telephone number is (571)272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Douglas B Blair/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2442